DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 096 | 24 | UD 010 466

AUTHOR Ackerman, Donald
TITLE A Study of School Activities Intended to Effect Racial, Economic, or Social Balance. Final Report.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-8-B-085
PUB DATE 18 Aug 69
GRANT OEG-0-8-080085-3729(010)
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$4.05
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Attitudes, *Cooperative Programs, *Disadvantaged Youth, Economic Factors, *Equal Education, Financial Needs, Parent Attitudes, *Program Evaluation, Racial Balance, *School Activities, Social Change, Teacher Education, Urban Education

ABSTRACT

The focus of this study is on the problems and prospects of providing quality education to children of the disadvantaged inner city school districts, particularly in the face of continued movement of the more affluent families to suburban areas. Based on examination of the literature on the many facets of the urban-suburban education problem, on reports and proposals for on-going cooperative urban-suburban programs, and on visits to programs or program officials, the following were the findings that emerged: (1) academic achievement of disadvantaged students exposed to cooperative programs has been significantly high; (2) trouble spots anticipated in these programs (such as behavior problems) did not materialize; and, (3) general opposition to these programs by parents and taxpayers decreased with time. Among the recommendations suggested are: (1) development of a model to bring such cooperative programs to the attention of all citizens; (2) expansion of teacher training programs by schools of education to include appreciation of urban-suburban problems; and, (3) establishment of a national committee on goals for urban-suburban education in order to take care of research on and the funding of such programs. (RJ)

ED041096

PA 24

Final Report

Project No. 8B085
Grant No. OEG0-8-080085-3729 (010)

A Study of School Activities Intended to Effect Racial, Economic, or Social Balance

Donald Ackerman

State University of New York

Stony Brook, New York

UD010466

August 18, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Acknowledgements	2
2.	Summary	3
3.	Introduction	7
4.	Methods	11
5.	Results	13
6.	Conclusions	29
7.	Recommendations	31
8.	References	33
9.	Appendix	36

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. To the Superintendent of Schools, Alexander Raffone, Woodbridge, Connecticut, and to the two project directors of the Woodbridge Title III program--Joel Bahner and Jack Mulrain, for their assistance in both the genesis and the continuation of this program.

2. To Martin Buskin, Education editor of Newsday, who pioneered in an examination and exposition of urban-suburban cooperative educational practices.

3. To all education officials throughout the nation who responded to questionnaires, telephone calls, and other requests for assistance.

4. To the administration of the State University of New York for their enlightened practice of providing logistic support and released time for this as well as for all other sponsored research carried on by faculty and administrators.

2. SUMMARY

One of the key dilemnas facing American education in the closing years of the 20th Century entails the provision of quality education to children of the disadvantaged inner-city school districts. Continued movement of the more affluent families to suburban areas has also clouded the essential balance of pupils from varied racial, economic and social backgrounds. It has been suggested that the so-called "advantaged" suburban pupils suffer from the shallowness and lack of challenge resulting from completely homogeneous classrooms.

Many urban school districts sought to bring about such balance by busing pupils within the district itself. Such compulsory busing has run into contrary acts of Congress and has often led to taxpayer and parent resistance. A more serious result has been even further movement out of the school district on the part of white, middle-class parents--thus reducing the tax base and even more seriously limiting the chance of true racial balance in the schools. Schools in Detroit, Washington, New York, Chicago, Boston and other urban areas of the Northeast and Midwest can no longer be balanced--nor can the suburbs around them. The fiscal support for urban schools has diminished drastically, and the picture seems even worse when the opportunities for quality education in these areas are contrasted with the educations afforded to nearby suburbs.

It was evident that further efforts were needed to bridge this widening gap in educational opportunities for American children. Alice Miel concluded in The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia that the most urgent business in the schools of America today was to solve the "dual problems of suburban isolation and big-city segregation" which have stimulated "new and innovative thinking about suburban-urban pupil exchange . . . and other experiments aimed at breaking down artificial barriers between the city and its surrounding communities." Yet it has been only within the past three years that any constructive efforts to implement programs for the voluntary exchange of inner-city and suburban children have reached fruition.

In the fall of 1965, twenty-five first grade children from Rochester, New York, were sent on a voluntary basis to six neighborhood schools of the West Irondequoit Central School District. Later in the year, various individuals and organizations in Boston and suburban areas formed the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (METCO) which began operations the next school year. During the summer of 1966, an experimental program was held in the West Hartford (Connecticut) Summer School in cooperation with Northeast Hartford. That program, ended after one year, was in essence succeeded by the still continuing Woodbridge (Connecticut) Cooperative Urban-Suburban Summer Program. By the fall of 1966, a full-fledged cooperative program entitled PROJECT CONCERN had sprung up between the Hartford (Connecticut) Board of Education and five suburban areas during the academic year.

The author of this report has served as the evaluator of the Title III (ESEA) project in Woodbridge for the past three years, and felt at

the outset that such programs represented a great step forward and possibly a significant feature of American educational change during the next several decades. By 1968, PROJECT CONCERN spread to the Greater New Haven, Connecticut, area. The interest of educators in such diverse areas as Washington, D C , and Chicago, Illinois, had been aroused by preliminary reports; by articles such as were contained in Saturday Review (February 18, 1967) and in School Management (Martin Buskin; October, 1967); by the report of the U. S. Civil Rights Commission on Racial Isolation in the Public Schools; and by the beginnings of true research into the pros and cons of such programs by the Center for Urban Education and similar organizations. Boston's program was expanding, while it seemed that Great Neck, New York, and Wyandanch, New York, would soon consider and perhaps adopt experiments in their respective areas.

The author has examined all available reports, articles and analyses of existing programs. He has visited ongoing and potential projects, and has interviewed many officials concerned with their progress. He has continued to examine all facets of the Woodbridge experiment for which he has been named evaluator, expanding evaluative instruments to include reactions of parents and other citizens as well as the attitudinal changes of suburban and urban children themselves. He has corresponded with local and state leaders of education throughout the nation to learn of any additional experiments being considered as well as reactions to such programs. In studying newspaper clippings and articles in current educational journals, he has sought information on districts considering such programs in the future and has noted the methods utilized in proposing the program as well as the reaction by teachers, educators, citizens and public officials alike. He has sought to discover the feasibility of such programs, their effect on the children involved, their impact on the communities supporting the projects, and the possibility of expansion through other areas of the nation in the future.

Such an analysis proved to be difficult indeed. Most programs are still so new as to defy effective evaluation. Some evaluations took little or no account of attitudinal change or parent reaction. The Woodbridge and West Hartford studies of summer programs were handicapped by the lack of concomitant control groups. Each year external forces such as political events, racial tensions, etc., affected the internal aspects of many programs. With the disclaimer that the conclusions and recommendations represent analyses of a small number of programs and that much remains to be done, the following represent a summary of findings to date:

1. The academic achievement of inner-city pupils exposed to programs of this nature has been high to a significant degree. Even though most suburban children started ahead of their urban counterparts, their progress, too, was positive.

2. The trouble spots anticipated by detractors of these programs (such as behavior problems, inter-racial disagreements and fighting,

and community strife) not only did not result but also were in many cases less evident than one would expect in non-mixed situations. As one project director remarked, "The most important thing that happened was that nothing happened."

3. While social change and improvements in critical thinking can not be analyzed at this time, some evaluative instruments have revealed steady and significant progress in attitudinal change by both inner-city and suburban pupils, especially in the case of the latter.

4. Generally, "hawkish" opposition to these programs by parents and taxpayers of the communities involved (which was especially evident among suburban groups) decreased as the program operated. Those most opposed became almost neutral toward the project, while those previously neutral became mild supporters.

5. Despite the success of programs now in operation, residents of suburbs which have considered similar projects in the past year's time have expanded their "taxpayers' revolt" and "civil rights backlash" to these programs in areas ranging from suburban Long Island to the New Haven, Connecticut, area. Campaigns which approach the "whispering" stage have handicapped the growth of even voluntary, cooperative programs of pupil interchange and thus have cast doubts on future expansion of the urban-suburban movement.

6. Analysis of the conclusions above coupled with any crude sociological sense would indicate that if these programs are not broadened to include more participants and more areas of the nation, some more radical mechanism such as expanded school district boundaries might well be considered seriously.

Along with the obvious recommendation that further study must be given to the results of these programs as they mature and as more objective evidence becomes available, the writer also feels that:

1. A model must be developed for interested communities to bring the objectives, advantages, and applications of such cooperative programs to the attention of all citizens. This must include not only an improved scope of evaluative instruments for judging achievement and attitudinal progress in existing programs but also politicial, social and economic aspects of urban-suburban programs of pupil interchange.

2. Schools of education must begin to expand their training of future teachers to include an appreciation of the problems of urban-suburban teaching; practice in the techniques of inner-city teachers; research in problems involving the possible restructure of traditional school district boundaries; and curricular changes to incorporate items of significance to all racial, social, and cultural groups of pupils.

3. As the Coleman report on "Equality of Educational Opportunity" pointed out, the reason nonwhite pupils learn less than whites lies outside the classroom. It is apparent that economic aspects of education should be related to and perhaps subjegated to an emphasis by all teachers and administrators on appropriate changes in a pupil's social and cultural life.

4. Many communities have wished to institute programs of pupil interchange between urban and suburban schools but have failed because of fiscal problems. Title III funds are only granted for up to three years, while Title I funds often are too widely disbursed throughout the school districts of any given state. The budget of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which funded the West Hartford project, has been cut drastically. It is vital that a national committee on goals for urban-suburban education be established, perhaps under the aegis of the U. S. Office of Education, to disseminate research and analyses of these programs and to place funding of experimental projects throughout the nation on a sound footing by attracting foundation and citizen support.

3. INTRODUCTION

The problem facing modern American education to which this study has addressed itself is actually two-fold. On the one hand, as Dr. Thomas Mahan stated in a position paper on education and racial imbalance in the city, we have "the inescapable conclusion that youngsters from lower socio-economic backgrounds living in disadvantaged areas of the inner city fail to respond to the typical school environment in terms of desired academic achievement." A brief analysis of most sociological studies in the field of education today would reinforce this statement--particularly at a time when quality education demands almost massive doses of funding and when the tax base of inner city areas decreases in terms of real purchasing power.

In terms of social and cultural values, however, a newer school of thought, represented by a group of researchers under the direction of Prof. Alice Miel of Columbia University whose study of a New York City suburb led to the publication of The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia. Fred Hechinger, education editor of The New York Times, began his introduction to this study with a story of a little girl in a wealthy community who was asked to write a composition about a poor family. Her essay began:

> This family was very poor. The Mommy was poor. The Daddy was poor. The brothers and sisters were poor. The maid was poor. The nurse was poor. The butler was poor. The cook was poor. And the chauffeur was poor.

All of which led Hechinger to conclude, "Too many of the suburbs have become compounds which, even though they are not protected by the barbed wire of their military counterparts in occupied territories, nevertheless set their inhabitants apart from the 'outside' world." And, following a four-year study designed to learn how the public schools in a representative suburban community prepare children for a world peopled by men and women of many different nations, races, religions, and economic backgrounds, Prof. Miel summed up the results as follows:

> The overall impression one carries away is that something is missing in New Village. . . . in one aspect of their education suburban children are underprivileged. Though other races, other nationalities, other generations have a great deal to teach them, there is little in their education, formal or otherwise, to familiarize them with the rich diversity of American life. In this sense, despite the many enviable features of their environment, the children of suburbia are being shortchanged.

Where the inner cities are becoming increasingly populated with minority races as more affluent residents move to suburbs, one of the suggestions for relief has involved cooperation between the inner cities and the surrounding suburbs. De facto segregation, many educators now

realize, is a community-wide problem and must be solved on a community wide basis.

Former superintendent of schools in New York, Dr. Bernard Donovan, stressed that the prototype "School for the year 2000" program sought a new and total concept which "could lead to a new type of educational system that would extend beyond the city boundaries and take in suburban areas, perhaps even nearby areas in Connecticut, to form a metropolitan school district." In August, 1969, teachers' union President Albert Shanker agreed and mentioned a school district which would include New York City, Westchester, Nassau and Suffolk within its boundaries.

A Department of Health, Education and Welfare policy planning task force made similar recommendations in a 1966 study, with Dr. Howe going so far as to say, "If I have my way, the suburban school districts will be gerrymandered so that they reach into the inner city and take in some of the slums." The following year, Racial Isolation, a report by the U. S. Civil Rights Commission, concluded that "What is really needed is a massive overhaul of school systems as a whole. In fact, with our inner cities moving in the direction of becoming minority centers surrounded by Caucasian suburbs, ultimate solutions will almost certainly have to be accomplished on a regional basis crossing local school district lines."

Robert Havighurst, writing in Nations' Schools in 1964, urged a regional outlook among citizens of metropolitan areas, stressing the moral responsibility of each segment of the metropolis to work for the welfare of the other parts. A later study by the Harvard Graduate School of Education and the work of Dr. Thomas Mahan, whose position paper was mentioned previously, inspired some action on the part of educational officials and citizens in both Connecticut and New York States, as well as in the Metropolitan Boston, Massachusetts area, to construct actual experimental programs to attempt to solve some of these problems.

The problems, of course, include economic, social, and just plain political aspects. They were best summarized in Racial Isolation as follows:

1. The Nation's metropolitan area populations also are becoming increasingly separated socially and economically. There are widening disparities in income and educational level between families in the cities and families in the suburbs.

2. The increasing racial, social and economic separation is reflected in the schools. School districts in metropolitan areas generally do not encompass both central city and suburban school districts. Thus, central city and suburban school districts, like the cities and suburbs themselves, enclose separate racial, economic, and social groups.

3. Racial, social, and economic separation between city and

suburb is attributable in a large part to housing policies and practices of both private industry and government at all levels.

4. Racial and economic isolation between city and suburban school systems is reinforced by disparities of wealth between cities and suburbs and the manner in which schools are financed.

One of the few early policy statements by a major city's Board of Education was that adopted by the Washington, D.C. Board on July 28, 1967, stating:

> The Board endorses the concept of maximum feasible integration of our students--racial, economic, cultural, and social--because it believes that integrated education is consistent with quality education. It pledges to capitalize upon the unparalleled richness of resources available in the Nation's Capital by full utilization of properly prepared volunteers. The Board faces up to the reality, however, that the flight to the suburbs of the middle-class white community has reduced to insignificance the option of racial integration of students in regular classroom situations, except possibly across cooperating school district boundary lines. The almost totally Negro school population constitutes the fact of our life. We must explore every possibility, however, of devising ways in which the association of children across ethnic, economic, or cultural lines may take place . . . on the assumption that in our pluralistic society we do all children a disservice to isolate them from reality.

Within two years several experiments in urban-suburban education had their beginning, in all cases voluntary and beginning, of necessity, with token enrollments and catchall funding programs. It seemed a trend in contemporary American education. Articles in Saturday Review, School Management, and similar publications outlined progress to date and hinted at greater developments ahead.

In late 1965, the West Hartford, Connecticut, public schools set up a summer program for the following year which would involve pupils from both urban and suburban areas. This act stemmed from a recommendation by the Center for Field Studies, Harvard Graduate School of Education, in a survey, Schools for Hartford. The program was discontinued after one summer, mainly due to the absence of the project director.

At the same time, the school board in West Irondequoit, New York, accepted the first group of first graders from racially imbalanced Rochester--a pioneer program in the regular academic year which was to grow from its original enrollment of 25 to a total of 300. Shortly thereafter, another experiment sponsored by METCO (Metropolitan Council

for Educational Opportunity) provided for the bussing of 220 children from Boston to seven suburban communities. This program included a host family for each bussed child to emphasize social interaction. By the fall of 1966, 255 disadvantaged inner city children from Hartford, Connecticut, were assigned to five suburbs in a Project Concern experiment, which, in 1968, spread to the Greater New Haven, Connecticut, area as well.

In the summer of 1967, New Haven and Woodbridge, Connecticut, received Title III funds to launch a cooperative, urban-suburban summer program which has just completed its third year. By the fall of 1968, academic year programs between the communities of Newark and Verona, New Jersey as well as an experimental plan involving Washington, D.C., and a portion of Montgomery County, Maryland, had been approved. It seemed as if the impetus for many more programs of this nature was underway. The school board of Great Neck, Long Island, was considering an invitation to youngsters from Little Neck--a less advantaged section of Queens, within New York City itself. In addition, the threatened dissolution of the troubled school district of Wyandanch, a Long Island enclave surrounded by affluent suburban areas, seemed to hold hope for some sort of cooperative program thirty miles from New York itself.

In turning down a request for dissolution, then-State Education Commissioner James Allen directed the District Superintendent to "secure the cooperation and assistance of the boards of education and staffs, parents, community leaders, and organizations of all the school districts surrounding Wyandanch in efforts to develop wider understanding of the social, racial and educational problems of the Wyandanch School District, and to consider corrective measures, including voluntary arrangements for the exchange of pupils, which may result in both immediate and long term solutions of the problems of this wider community."

It is now summer, 1969, and the efforts in Great Neck and Wyandanch have thus far come to naught. The other experiments are proceeding despite, in some cases, strong negative citizen reaction to any drastic expansion of the programs. If the phenomenon of urban-suburban cooperation through interchange of pupils is to continue, a balanced presentation of the pros and cons of such programs is necessary, with recommendations for future action, if judged beneficial, to follow. Too much heat and too little light has thus far been generated over the progress of these experiments to date.

As the principal investigator of this study, it was my responsibility to analyze the programs in being in order to intelligently assess any benefits to both groups of pupils involved; to look into areas of parent and taxpayer concern in the communities participating; and to transpose the conclusions reached into recommendations which might be utilized in areas facing similar challenges should their needs require consideration of urban-suburban cooperative programs in the future.

4. METHODS

A first step in the methodology of this study was a perusal of the literature, professional and popular, which discussed the sociology of education; applicability of school district boundaries to modern education; problems of urban and suburban schools; and, of course, reports and proposals for actual in-being urban-suburban cooperative programs such as those in Boston, Rochester, Hartford, Woodbridge, and similar areas.

In order to assure myself that those generally known programs were not exhaustive of the field, letters were written with telephone call followups to city and state school officials to ascertain any additional projects or any projected programs not yet known to me. While this correspondence resulted in little tangible assistance to the study itself, it illustrated graphically the lack of experimentation throughout the nation in urban-suburban problems as well as a dearth of knowledge even of the Boston and Rochester programs by officials in the South, Midwest, Mountain, and Pacific Coast areas and even by some in the Northeast. In addition, it did bring to light some interesting cooperative activities among school districts in such diverse areas as vocational education, cultural activities, and other subjects which could be handled at a centralized level better than by a district itself.

Visits to programs or program officials throughout the East occupied much of my time, as did an analysis of progress reports, evaluative studies, results of testing, and other indices of pupil progress. One of the more difficult aspects of this study was the fact that in all programs different measurement devices were utilized to measure this progress or, in some cases, few if any objective devices were attempted. In only a few instances were efforts made to include attitudinal measures--mainly because so few are available. Parent reactions were rarely studied except subjectively. Even the most expertly evaluated programs either lacked control groups or some other necessary feature. Finally, in each and every case, given the short duration of the project (three years at the most) the evidence furnished cannot be taken too seriously as "the" answer to the success or failure of the project due to the need for further study as the children progress further in time and space.

Based on the evaluative devices and the testing procedures used in the Title III Woodbridge, Connecticut, program during the past three years--some of which were designed expressly for the experiment by the author--I hoped to design an evaluative model plan with local variations for more effective measurement of the success of these programs. I was therefore especially anxious to note new testing and evaluative procedures in other projects which could be incorporated into such a model, emphasizing systematic approaches to introduce, explain, and evaluate the concept of urban-suburban interchange programs to the

citizens of areas considering future utilization of these projects.

It was with this educational function in mind that another method--that of examining current controversies in the field--evolved in this study. The two case studies of Great Neck and Wyandanch, New York, both consumed large amounts of type in local and regional newspapers during 1968 and 1969. By following the material in print and by discussing certain aspects of the controversies with those in the areas involved, I gained a greater perspective into the issues and also a greater understanding of an overall problem in urban-suburban programs generally. Politics is involved. Economic issues are involved. Sociology and psychology is vital to an understanding of citizen reaction. All issues are far from clearcut and objective in nature. Therefore, I soon found that any model for school boards or citizens or parents must include subjective as well as objective materials, and must be part of a greater educational campaign than can be carried on with minimal planning and objectives.

Once my reading was done, my interviews were held, my studies of reports were completed, and my analysis of the main case studies was carried out, my conclusions and recommendations were formulated based, I again emphasize, on many subjective factors stemming from the results of tests, evaluations, and expert opinions as well as from the economic, social and political setting in which programs of this nature must be viewed in our dynamic American society of today.

5. RESULTS

One of the more obvious results of this study can be best expressed by a brief analysis of each of the major programs--West Hartford, Project Concern, METCO, Rochester-West Irondequoit, and Woodbridge, with briefer notes on the Newark-Verona and Washington, D.C.-Bannockburn, Maryland proposals. Following this will be reports on two case studies of projected programs which "never made it", due mainly to factors unrelated to the merits of the proposals themselves. From these results and my interpretation of their significance and applicability to a universal model, conclusions and recommendations will then be formulated.

1. WEST HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT.

The aforementioned report on Schools for Hartford proposed "a more fundamental approach . . . (which was the education of) children from the city's poverty areas in schools in surrounding suburban towns on a two-pupils-per-classroom basis." Perhaps few places in the Northeast could duplicate the diversity of conditions between inner-city North Hartford and West Hartford. The average family income in West Hartford was over $11,000, while in Hartford's North End about 1/3 of the families earned less than $3,000 in annual income. Unemployment in the Hartford area reached 8.5% in the winter of 1964-65. As far as the educational effects of this diversity on the Hartford students were concerned, the Harvard study reported that:

> Children in the elementary schools in the poverty area are six months behind the city average in mental age, as determined by verbal IQ tests, when they enter the first grade. After five years in school, the average child in the poverty areas is almost a year and a half behind the Hartford average in reading achievement, spelling, and word knowledge.

Voluntary students from the target area in Hartford and from the suburb of West Hartford came together for the beginning of the West Hartford Summer School, and were divided into elementary, middle, and high school levels. Of the 1,260 students attending the program, 15.6% were Hartford students dwelling within the poverty area. The summer school opened on July 5, 1966, and continued for 29 days of instruction.

It is evident that any summer school operating for six weeks or less should have limited, experimental objectives at best. The West Hartford school staff, with somewhat ambitious goals, set the following as its objectives:

> It should serve as a prototype of the 'ideal' school, focusing on current themes in instruction like team teaching, individualized instruction, programmed learning,

non-gradedness and the new curricula. In-service workshops should deal with the application of these themes to daily instruction during the summer. The program should also serve as the site for an experiment in urban-suburban mixing.

To this observer, it seemed as if these objectives were quite lofty for the first year of a six-week summer program. Many of the evaluative instruments consisted of reports on bus behavior, on dropout incidence, and on subjective reactions of teachers. Elaborate efforts were made to construct evidence of social and economic characteristics of the parent respondents. For a study of the effects of the program on academic achievement, pre- and post- tests were given with the aid of the vocabulary and reading comprehension subtests of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

However, by the admission of the evaluators themselves, problems resulted--particularly because of late funding by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Post-testing was not carried out until early October. Some Hartford participants had to be tested at the summer school, while some members of the control group could not be tested at all. Students in grades 1 and 2 and in grades 8 through 12 could not be tested.

Results showed that the experimental group gained over the control group in reading comprehension score, but the difference could have occurred by chance once in ten times--thus only suggesting that exposure to the summer school fostered learning among the Hartford students in grades 3 through 7. Little, other than the absence of behavior problems, was advanced to show attitudinal change. Nothing was done vis-a-vis the attitudes of parents. One could agree with the evaluators' conclusion that "the six week mixed summer school appears to have produced some positive educational effects on poverty-area youngsters in grades three through seven." But little is known as to the accomplishments of the suburban children involved.

The evaluators stated that tendencies toward greater integration by the pupils were suggested but not significantly. Pre-conditions seemed to be supported by the strongest findings--poverty-area parents were willing to send their youngsters--the bus trip did not appear to be an obstacle--attendance records indicated a high level of morale--teachers endorsed integrated schooling (though this could have been expected by the recruitment procedure). The evaluators concluded that "the substantive questions about the effect upon learning and upon social relationships of a mixed school are not unambiguously answered in this report. Further research is necessary."

Despite the lack of such answers, West Hartford was a beginning. And further research was in progress in that very area. The school year urban-suburban program of Project Concern would involve a larger time period and would involve comparison with children in urban segregated schools in order that the special effects of mixing could be more carefully scrutinized.

2. PROJECT CONCERN.

In 1966, the City of Hartford, Connecticut, faced two basic problems insofar as their educational system was concerned. First, objective evidence showed that disadvantaged youngsters in the inner city schools failed to respond effectively to their school environment; and second, efforts to correct this situation by way of smaller classes, better teachers, new curricula, and new physical facilities have generally been disappointing. The non-white school population had reached the 56% mark. Hartford was an ideal city in which to conduct an experimental intervention to provide equal educational opportunity for these youth and to determine whether this project would result in more effective stimulation toward growth.

As mentioned previously, the Hartford Board of Education, with the support of the Chamber of Commerce and other civic organizations, contracted with the Harvard Graduate School of Education to suggest an overall plan for future development and in this plan, known as "The Harvard Report", the team suggested that Hartford could no longer solve its educational problems by itself but instead had to look toward metropolitan cooperation if quality education was to be provided to all youth. A seminar called the Town Meeting of Tomorrow, gathering together the business, industrial, civic, and political leaders of the greater Hartford area to discuss common problems and solutions, gave tacit endorsement to these suggestions. Soon, the Connecticut State Department of Education agreed to sponsor a proposal for an experimental program of urban-suburban cooperation which was endorsed by the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce.

The goals of this program were to be the placement of 300 youngsters in elementary grades in four suburban school systems, on a vacant space basis, with no more than three such youngsters to a single classroom. Under Connecticut law, the responsibility for decisions was placed with each local Board of Education rather than with town meetings or with referenda. Obviously, the invitations touched off strong debate in each of the suburban school systems. Hearings on the subject resulted in sharp and vehement debate, with seemingly more negative than positive reactions. Farmington, Manchester, and West Hartford supported the invitation while the fourth town, Glastonbury, rejected the offer on a tied vote. However, as a result of their own initiative, the towns of Simsbury and South Windsor also agreed to participate--making a total of five towns which ultimately accepted 266 youngsters, randomly selected from Hartford schools with 85% or more non-white population. Project Concern began on September 4, 1966--and its report issued in August, 1968, by Dr. Thomas Mahan, Associate Dean of Education at the University of Hartford, clearly and forcefully recounts what happened "to those youngsters who, at 7:30 a.m. each day, climb aboard those yellow school buses that slowly wind their way through crowded and disadvantaged sections of Hartford and move to the affluent suburbs which are only a few miles away."

Funding of the program proved to be a changing feature--for 1966-67 it depended on Title I and Title III ESEA funds, money from the City of Hartford, and funds from Title IV of the Civil Rights Act. The next year saw an additional $50,000 from the Ford Foundation but less from the Civil Rights Act. Public Act 611 passed by the 1967 Connecticut General Assembly for programs like Project Concern now provides 22% of the current budget. This legislative action has paved the way for

expansion of the program into the New Haven area.

A careful testing program was worked out to measure growth and change in each of eight critical areas. The verbal Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children and the Test of Primary Mental Abilities have been used for mental ability measures. For school skills, the Metropolitan Readiness was used at the primary grades and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and later the Sequential Test of Educational Progress for grades 3-6. Test Anxiety Scales and the General Anxiety Scales (Sarason) checked anxiety and self-esteem, while sociometric techniques checked on peer acceptance. Interviews of a sample of 54 youngsters were conducted by a college student using a highly structured format to delve into pupil attitude, while an anonymous questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of 700 suburban familes in 1967 to check suburban parental attitudes. The achievement of suburban children was ascertained by the annual school testing program in suburban systems, while rating scales filled out by each classroom teacher on each experimental youngster analyzed teacher perception. In addition, the usual variables such as attendance, dropouts and occupational aspirations were collected and analyzed.

Based on this well-rounded testing program, the results of all instruments reported, and the summary written by Dr. Mahan, it is apparent that some successes were shown by this program. Taking inner-city children who were at a disadvantage on entering the program, it was found that youngsters sent to suburban classrooms at grades K-3 had a significantly greater tendency to show growth in mental ability scores than those remaining in inner city classrooms. Measures of reading readiness, reading ability and mathematical ability showed a similar pattern. Most of the children expressed a liking for the program, and little or no evidence showed negative psychological or social consequences resulting from participation. Suburban children appeared to accept inner-city children at face value, and experience with the program seemed to decrease feelings of antagonism among suburban residents. Tensions or anxieties did not grow with placement in a suburban school--what evidence exists tends to show the opposite. And, while suburban children did not achieve more than would normally be expected, placement of two or three inner city children in a suburban classroom had no measurable negative effects on such academic achievement.

Today the Hartford experiment includes buses to 86 schools in Hartford and 15 surrounding towns, extending to areas such as Bolton, Plainville, Suffield and Granby--from 10-15 miles away. The program is healthy and has apparently reached its geographic limitations. In the fall of 1968, again after intense and diverse public hearings in the New Haven area, a similar program was adopted with nine towns committing themselves to take about 250 New Haven "ghetto" youngsters. In the fact sheet for the New Haven Area Project Concern, director Joseph Samuels noted that "the limited objective testing being conducted by a Southern Connecticut Evaluation Team is incomplete. . . . We are convinced that most of the children have grown academically and that some have not. Our response is based upon the personal 'educated' opinion of the suburban teachers and administrators who are working daily with the children."

It is interesting to note that the New Haven Area Project Concern Contract signed by the President of the New Haven Board of Education and his suburban counterparts says, "Bussing of _____ students to New Haven schools under this plan shall not be allowed under any circumstances." Despite this clause, a whispering campaign has struck this project during the early summer of 1969. A controversy in the Stratford area over the adoption of a new area Project Concern has erupted. Some communities were forced to hold to the level of 1968-69 instead of planned expansion in the year ahead. A Council of Concerned Citizens of Orange, Connecticut, demanded a referendum and stated that "the concept that a black youngster must sit next to a white one to improve himself is ridiculous and insulting to the black people." While one could look at Hartford's program and measure its successes, the lack of time for an evaluation and citizen arousals in the New Haven area make that portion of Project Concern less amenable to conclusions at this time.

3. METCO

The Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity was founded in early 1966 to give some of the children from Boston's black ghettos a chance for better schooling than they had been getting in the decaying and troubled Boston public schools. Those who have read Jonathan Kozol's work, Death at an early age, the story of Negro children in the Boston public schools, are aware of some of these problems from a secondary point of view.

Volunteer students from grades K-11 are bussed from Boston into schools in nearly all-white suburbs. The receiving communities have committed themselves to educating the participating children until their graduation from high school, thus providing a measure of continuity to the program. A "host family" has been provided for every bussed child, with the home serving as a telephone source for emergencies, providing social contacts, and maintaining a personal relationship with the child's own family. In this case, the program has been financed through a combination of funds from Title III of the ESEA and money from the Carnegie Corporation, which has provided money for the salaries and offices of the project director and his staff. Here again the state legislature has passed a bill to allow the state to pay part or all of the tuition and transportation costs for such programs. METCO has established a finance committee to explore ways to attract more funding for an expanded program.

Such an expansion is necessary in view of the fact that during 1968-69 over 900 black pupils attended classes in 28 participating communities. More than 700 other children are on the waiting list, while 8 other suburban communities have applied to join the program. Perhaps this program more than any of the others has led to social change and modification of parental attitudes. As evaluated in a New York Times article by Lisa Hammel:

> For some black and white parents, who have taken this opportunity to come together for the first time, however tentatively, it has meant the bare glimmer of a sense of one another as human beings rather than as mystifying and

> and frightening racial stereotypes. . . . But for the small children, who started school together in kindergarten and who for three years have played together and slept in one another's houses, it has meant the beginning of a wise and innocent vision beyond the color of the skin to the humanity beneath.

Executive Director Ruth Batson admits that "there have been some incidents, and none of these things have been unexpected. With little kids, you have simple problems; with bigger kids, more complicated problems." One such problem was touched off by a fight between two girls--one white and one black--which resulted in a school boycott by black METCO high school students in Lexington and a counter-boycott by the white students who complained that school officials were practicing "reverse discrimination". Snowstorms closing schools and a more permanent solution of gripe sessions with the Lexington Superintendent of Schools helped alleviate the immediate crisis, but did little to dispel the notion here and elsewhere that such programs are more effective with younger pupils than with those of high school age.

Meaningful evaluation through testing procedures is only now becoming available at the end of the third year of the METCO project on the basis of some achievement testing and on the basis of interesting figures on index of popularity and index of reciprocation. Evidence is sketchy but should increase in the future on the academic improvements of black pupils from Boston but is more significant and favorable in the case of parent involvement, attitudinal changes on the part of the elementary pupils, and the social impact of the program.

4. ROCHESTER-WEST IRONDEQUOIT.

As a result of an August, 1963, declaration of policy by the Board of Education of Rochester, New York, that "one of the functions of the public schools is to prepare children for life in a democratic society" and that "the fulfillment of this function depends in part upon the degree to which children have opportunities during their public school careers to become acquainted with children from a variety of cultures", an open enrollment plan was initiated and, eventually, discussions began outside the city proper. These discussions had their impetus from the desire of the West Irondequoit Board of Education to provide their children with opportunities to have contact with more non-white children and, ultimately, meetings between the Superintendents were held to discuss a possible extension of the Open Enrollment Plan to West Irondequoit.

By 1965, the city of Rochester had nine elementary schools with a pupil population of more than 50% nonwhite and the percentage of nonwhite in the city schools, standing at 30%, was growing at a rate of 2% per year. In contrast, the West Irondequoit School District had four Negro pupils enrolled out of 5,800 pupils. In March, 1965, the West Irondequoit Board attempted to alleviate this urban-suburban imbalance by accepting twenty-five first graders from the Rochester schools in six neighborhood suburban schools, with 25 more to be added each year until there is a total of 300--25 in each of 12 grades.

In funding this project, Rochester agreed to pay the tuition and the transportation costs for all bussed pupils. Much of this cost is reimbursed by the State and by Federal Funds under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A booklet issued by the West Irondequoit Committee for Intercultural Education notes that a single inner-city child attending West Irondequoit for the full twelve years of school would result in the district receiving nearly $14,000 but not resulting in the addition of any teachers or classrooms. In fact, they point out that the district is eligible for an additional $2,684 in construction cost aid for each inner-city child attending a West Irondequoit school. The committee, in detailing additional features of their activities such as curriculum enrichment, exchange visits, teacher exchange, and community mothers to establish links between the two communities, concludes that "Will the youth of West Irondequoit be better equipped than their parents to solve interracial and intercultural problems? We cannot be certain yet. But we do have to be certain that we are trying!"

At first, evaluative efforts at West Irondequoit consisted mainly of observational reports from teachers and administrators; an interim evaluation jointly conducted by the two school districts; interviews by a sociologist; and a three-day observation by a five-man State Education Department team. Eventually, state funds were provided to employ a consultant to assist the professional staff in an evaluation of the educational values of various program phases. By 1968, control and experimental groups could be compared on standardized tests and sociometric techniques as to reading and arithmetic records and social growth. Included among the instruments of measurement were the Metropolitan Readiness Tests, New York State Readiness Tests, Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Science Research Associates Reading Achievement Test, and Reading and Arithmetic Tests for New York State Elementary Schools.

The most meaningful figure involves the "group one" students who began Grade One in September, 1965, and completed three grades by June, 1968. A total of fifteen comparisons were made during the three years involving these pupils, and seven showed differences in achievement that were statistically significant--all favoring the transferred pupils in West Irondequoit. For "Group Two" pupils five of the eight comparisons showed significant differences--all favoring the transferred pupils, while for "Group One" pupils one of four comparisons showed a similar difference. It would be difficult to disagree with the Coordinator of Planning and Research's conclusion that "in summary, the test data for pupils in all three groups show that the achievement of the transferred pupils in West Irondequoit is approximately equal to, and in several instances higher, than would be expected had these pupils remained at School No. 19."

Sociometric data did not form as conclusive a picture regarding adjustment except to indicate that, on the whole, the majority of children from School No. 19 are adjusting well to the suburban school situation and are being well-received by their West Irondequoit classmates. However, as the evaluators point out, factors other than race may have affected the results to some degree, as might the fact that the children are still extremely young and thus change their preferences quite often in the course of a year.

An interesting facet of the evaluation is contained in "A Longitudinal Study of the West Irondequoit Program of Integrated Education" by Hitti, Green, and Sanderson. While finding that "integration to the extent practiced has not had negative effects on the achievement of the West Irondequoit pupils, in fact, it may be spurring the Integrated pupils on to somewhat higher than usual achievement", the authors warn that "unfortunately, the ICE (bussed) pupils are not gaining at the same rate as the West Irondequoit pupils. The trend appeared to be accelerating in the 3rd grade. If the reason or reasons for this trend cannot be identified and corrected, then serious unantipated and unintended results may occur. These results suggest a definite need for further study which should be undertaken without delay."

We thus have the phenomenon of the bussed students apparently progressing at a faster rate than the control group but falling further and further behind the suburban children in their integrated class. This is a further reason why a fourth, or fifth, or even a sixth year of continued observations and study may be necessary for a completely effective and appropriate analysis of urban-suburban program evaluations.

Another portion of the West Irondequoit observation dealt with the compilation, summary and appraisal of responses to interview schedules developed with the assistance of the Intercultural Enrichment Committee to catalog attitudes and observations by teachers and administrators in the program. The usual pattern of anecdotal responses was collected and interpreted, and basically conclusions indicate that few difficulties were encountered by either teachers, librarians, specialists or administrators because of the presence of the Rochester children. However, it was found that while teachers were interested in the program and cooperated with it, few if any planned to utilize the desegregated situation as an aid to learning or to take advantage of the city children as a learning resource. There was also a feeling among the middle school teachers that there might have to be a concentrated effort to improve the abilities of the bussed children in light of the demonstrated fact that they were lagging behind the more "advantaged" children of West Irondequoit.

It is of interest that the administrators' evaluations consisted of references to teacher recruitment, outside recognition of the "status" of education in West Irondequoit, and statements to the effect that this interchange program was less an educational innovation than it was a "gradual bringing of subject matter and teaching techniques more in line with what has for some time been recognized as relevant to student needs and abilities at each grade level."

5. WOODBRIDGE-NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

In October, 1966, Woodbridge, Connecticut Superintendent of Schools Alexander Raffone addressed a memo to his Board of Education on a possible urban-suburban mixing plan asking them to give some thought to the formulation of a summer program opened to children of Woodbridge and New Haven on a voluntary basis, with suitable controls and evaluative studies to assure that, while the program would gather information of a valuable nature to assist in the further development of programs for urban and

suburban cooperation, the Board would not relinquish its responsibility to provide the highest quality education to the Town's children. Following meetings with officials of the New Haven Board of Education, application was made for a Title III grant for the summer of 1967 and approval was received barely in time to solicit enrollment and recruit personnel.

Woodbridge is a suburban residential town seven miles from New Haven with a population of approximately 7,000, and is considered to stand relatively high on the socioeconomic scale. The town's main source of revenue is derived from personal property since there is virtually no industry or commercial business. The Town has a high percentage of professional people, many of whom are associated with Yale University. In contrast, New Haven, with a population of approximately 170,000, suffers from pockets of poverty and social unrest despite vast redevelopment programs. While 1% of the Woodbridge population is estimated to be nonwhite, 48.1% of the elementary school children were Negro and 5.4% Puerto Rican. Of the 33 elementary schools in New Haven in 1967, only 8 were substantially integrated.

Following a stormy public hearing and some opposition on the Board of Education, the program approval established a summer school of 100 pupils, with 75 being drawn from Woodbridge and 25 from the inner-city--all, incidently, from the Prince School in the Hill District. In 1968, the program was expanded to include 150 children and to narrow the ratio of suburban to inner-city pupils to 2-1 (100 to 50). While some Title III budgetary cutbacks forced the enrollment back down to 100 for the summer, 1969, program, a 60-40 ratio was attained at that time. The goals of the program were (and are) the following:

1. To determine the feasibility of urban-suburban school mixing.
2. To determine the benefits or deficits that accrue to children involved in the program.
3. To determine to what extent cooperative programs can be developed between urban and suburban school districts.
4. To determine what effect such programs have on the adult community.

To analyze and evaluate this summer program effectively, a balanced, broad-based evaluative program was developed by the author somewhat along the lines of that used by Dr. Morton Shaevitz, of the Department of Psychology of the University of Michigan, who was also faced with a dearth of attitudinal instruments when evaluating progress at the W. J. Maxey Boys Training School, Whitmore Lake, Michigan. New instruments were devised especially for this project, and were utilized in conjunction with standardized attitudinal tests and both objective and subjective interviews. Parents--teachers--pupils--parents not sending their children, all groups were to be covered to varying degrees at both the start and close of each year's project. While additional evaluative efforts were added as required during the second and third year of the project, the basic pattern and techniques prevailed from 1967 through summer, 1969.

Examples of original instruments utilized in the Woodbridge project are duplicated in the appendix to this final report. However, as detailed

in the annual report for the 1967 project, this attitudinal package consisted of the following:

GROUP	TYPE OF INSTRUMENT	TIME OF ADMINISTRATION
1. Teachers:	Interview (with taping)	Start of session
	Open-ended questionnaire	Following session
2. Pupils:	Achievement (Stanford)	Start and close of session Followup next May
	Attitudinal	Start and close of session Followup next May
3. Parents:		
New Haven	Attitudinal--sent to all whose children participated.	Start and close of session Followup next May
Woodbridge	Attitudinal--sent to all whose children participated.	
	Attitudinal--sent to random sample of 100 whose children did not participate.	

In the summer of 1968 and in 1969 on an expanded version, interviews were held with New Haven parents and with Woodbridge parents both sending and not sending their children to the summer school. With an emphasis on kindergarten pupils entering the classes in 1969, pre- and post- session administration of the Gates-MacGinitie Readiness Tests was geared to this age group with the Stanford achievement tests continuing to form the basis of achievement evaluation for older pupils. Should outside funding be available to continue the program in 1970 (Title III projects are phased out over a three-year period as far as federal funding is concerned) it is hoped that a critical thinking analysis can be made and that a control group might be established. Normal achievement growth during the six-week period on a calendar month basis has been used to date.

What has been achieved in the Woodbridge experiment, despite its summer time span and other problems, is significant since the overall plan of evaluation touches parents, pupils, and other citizens alike, and is related to a project which at first generated widespread opposition among the citizenry of Woodbridge. The final report for this project was delayed, for one reason, to take advantage of the third year of experience in the Woodbridge summer program and, as such, represents a three-year evaluative report--characteristic of no other program save that of Rochester and West Irondequoit insofar as programs of this nature are concerned.

Another interesting aspect of the 1969 summer program in Woodbridge is the fact that several children brought from the New Haven area to Woodbridge under Project Concern during academic year 1968-69 were included. Eventually, statistics on the performance of those pupils might help to answer the question as to whether a summer followup would continue to

be marked by achievmental and/or attitudinal improvements by Project Concern participants or whether they had peaked during the school year. A copy of the summer, 1969, evaluative schedule for the Woodbridge program is included in the appendix.

Despite the fact that academic achievement was not a particularly emphasized goal of the program, children in the Woodbridge project showed improvement on achievement tests far above expectations for the six-week period. New Haven children surpassed norms at a level statistically significant at the .01 level in all three years of the program, while Woodbridge pupils, who began ahead of the inner-city children, gained significantly during two of the three year program periods. More important, both groups improved significantly in their attitudes in agreement with the fundamental goals of the program in each of the three years, with an emphasis on the younger children's progress attitudinally.

More important for the purposes of this study were the attitudes of the parents. Of course, the parents sending their children to the program in Woodbridge had a better attitude toward its goals than the parents not sending children--though many of the latter group had defensible reasons ranging from summer camp to family vacations for the failure of their children to attend. However, during the second and third years of the evaluation, the non-sending parents moved more and more toward agreement with the aims of the program. Parental interviews noted actual shifts from violently opposed to neutral and from mildly opposed to mildly in favor. Moreover, the hearings before the Board of Education drew less and less radical opposition and more and more "we know the program is here--let's improve it and make it better" type of statements. The vote to hold the program for a third year was unanimous. It must be noted, however, that the Woodbridge Board of Education has always refused to permit reciprocal "reverse" bussing activities in which Woodbridge children would visit the inner-city New Haven area.

While the Woodbridge program has had little national impact in view of its summer setting, it has illustrated more vividly than most other projects the gradual easing of citizen strife and opposition once the worst fears of opponents are not realized and incidents do not occur. It has also demonstrated an objective mechanism for assessing attitudinal change which, coupled with subjective observations of teachers and parents, represents a beginning toward a model evaluative analysis of programs of this type.

During the conduct of this study, it became apparent that two case studies in particular had applicability to the topic under scrutiny, and that not only projects in being but also projected programs should be analyzed due to the common threads running through their presentation, discussions, and resolutions. For this reason, the author has paid close attention to the controversies of Great Neck and Wyandanch, New York.

6. GREAT NECK-LITTLE NECK, NEW YORK

Up to the year 1968, no constructive urban-suburban program had as yet been proposed which would touch the problems of New York City proper.

Then residents of Great Neck, Long Island, proposed a plan to bus in students from New York City--across the line in Queens or perhaps from the nearby Bronx. The idea of bussing in 100 first-to-third grade students from New York to Great Neck was reinforced by a memorandum from the Center for Urban Education pointing out that programs in Rochester, Boston, and Hartford had resulted in better-than-expected progress in achievement level. Great Neck presented an outstanding contrast with New York City insofar as schools were concerned--only 4% of 10,000 pupils in Great Neck were Negro, while the district spent more than $2,000 per pupil on education--the highest in all of Long Island. Some supporters of the plan even felt that a start could be made by September, 1968.

The plan had much going for it. It involved the use of empty space in Great Neck schools and envisioned the project being paid for by federal, state and New York City funds. Some Great Neck taxpayers, however, worried about future budgetary commitments. Others noted with displeasure activities in New York City, where tensions between Negroes advocating community decentralization of schools and teacher union leaders had reached the breaking point. Anti-semitic charges against some New York black educators did not sit well in a Great Neck community composed of 70% Jewish. In May, 1968, the first school budget was defeated--indicating to some community resentment for the proposal. A public hearing drew over 500 residents, and an 800-signature petition urged a referendum on the issue. Committees ranging from the Committee for Conscience and Reason supporting the plan to the Parents Committee Against New York City to Great Neck School Busing were formed--as was a Board of Education-appointed committee which studied the issues, visited programs in being, and finally recommended a two-year plan designed to be "educationally sound for the incoming pupils as well as those currently in the Great Neck schools." No bussing was provided for Great Neck pupils into New York City areas. When the Board approved the plan, president Jerome Katzin noted that "experience in communities that have already engaged in similar programs proves that community support is essential to the success of any proposals such as this one," and called for community support which he deemed essential for the plan's implementation.

During the first year, between 45 and 60 pupils would be transported for enrollment in the kindergarten through second grade of Great Neck, and would be placed by pairs in classes that did not exceed 25 children. In the second year, children would be admitted to kindergarten only, with an evaluation of the program being made at the end of the second year to determine whether its aims had been achieved and whether to continue it. Approval by the community caused an increased polarization of Great Neck into groups favoring and opposing the plan, and eventually placed the school board in a position of depending on a referendum scheduled on February 6, 1969. Radio, newspapers, and television coverage likened Great Neck to a decisive battle in a World War--and at least a large part of the educational community watched, waited and listened.

No one knows what happened. In one of the more bizarre elections in modern times, two of three voting districts showed a slight majority opposing the plan, but a defective voting machine in the third wiped out the total votes, leaving the result in doubt. A crude analysis of the returns leads one to the conclusion that probably more votes would

have been cast against the plan than for it, but the result was thrown into confusion and the school board, obviously, was not bound by the result. The board approved the plan by a 3-2 vote. But a May 6 school board election found two candidates opposing the plan elected to seats vacated by its supporters. Even though their term of office would not begin until after the formal approval of the program would take effect, this raised an issue--would they honor the commitment to the second year of the plan.

In June of 1969, just after the State Education Department had approved an allocation of $47,897 to pay Great Neck's first-year share of the cost to educate 40 first and second graders from the predominantly Negro section of Queens, the interim New York City School Board rejected the plan in a telegram to the Great Neck School Board, citing the failure of the incoming School Board to support the plan and the lack of a guarantee for funds to continue the program for the entire two-year experimental period. To some, it was a cop out by New York, and to others the rejection was based on sufficient reasons. Needless to say, even if the plan had been approved there was a lack of meaningful community support as evidenced by budget votes, school board elections, and the inconclusive referendum.

7. WYANDANCH, NEW YORK.

As mentioned previously, Wyandanch, Long Island, is plagued by fiscal and education problems and sits as a Negro enclave among some of the more prosperous white school districts in New York State--Half Hollow Hills, West Babylon, Deer Park, North Babylon and Farmingdale. Containing close to 90% Negro enrollment in its schools, Wyandanch has been beset by inadequate facilities, lack of experienced teachers, and parental apathy. In November, 1967, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, contending that the district has too narrow a tax base to finance adequate education, recommended dissolving the district and having the 2,295 pupils absorbed into the five surrounding districts. This action was supported by a study conducted by New York City University.

Following a public hearing on May 7, 1968, in Albany, New York State Education Commissioner James Allen refused to issue the order, citing among the reasons an archaic state education law which made it almost impossible to dispose of the district's debt or to guarantee the tenure of its teachers. As Newsday education editor Martin Buskin stated, this was a dramatic challenge to the community itself and to the predominantly white white districts surrounding the area. He wrote:

> The difference is increased involvement of the Wyandanch community in seeing that its schools are given a maximum amount of local support to bring about much needed reforms, plus an unprecedented effort of voluntary assistance by neighboring districts. . . . These districts will have to breach the Berlin Walls of their boundaries and really do something about the problems of another school system.

Federal grants did continue to flow into Wyandanch. A Citizens Advisory Council was formed to make recommendations for improving

Wyandanch schools, and a Community College was supported by nearby educational institutions. A federally-funded group of four education specialists known as the Task Force Council detailed a program consisting at first of resident committees to examine different aspects of school life. As an outgrowth of Commissioner Allen's charge for regional cooperation, school administrators in Wyandanch and the five surrounding districts formed an inter-district council to seek new ways to improve education in the racially imbalanced, problem-plagued district. Supervisory District Superintendent Gordon Wheaton suggested that this assistance could include such things as exchanging students and lending teachers and other personnel.

The timing of any move could not have been planned any worse than was the case in the spring of 1969. The experience in Great Neck, recounted earlier, and the disturbances in New York City schools involving Negroes were on the minds of all Long Island parents and taxpayers. Schools were overcrowded and budgets were escalating annually. The so-called "backlash", in both economic and sociological terms, was never greater than when a special committee in Plainedge, Long Island, penned a report titled "Bridging the Racial Gap" which recommended, among other things, a special, integrated summer school program accepting nondistrict Negro students. The report was rejected by the Board of Education at a stormy meeting which drew an estimated 4,000 citizens in a jammed Plainedge High School. Cries of "We don't want another New York City" and "We want it smashed right here" indicated that an observer was correct in stating that the defeat had nothing to do with the pros and cons of the issue. One of the Board supporters said, "It was clear that the board of education without having examined the educational or fiscal aspects of the summer proposal was reacting to community opinion that was expressed without residents of the district having had a chance to read and know what was in the report." However, opponents of the plan cited not only community disapproval but also the fiscal aspects of the summer proposal. The raucous meeting was the culmination of several weeks of rumors in Plainedge as well as bitterness including threatening phone calls and namecalling. The reaction to the Plainedge proposal as well as the upcoming annual budget votes on Long Island made it apparent that any interchange of pupils involving Wyandanch or any other nearby community would take a lot of effort even to have the proposal considered on its merits.

8. OTHER PROGRAMS AND PROSPECTS

Beginning in the fall of 1968, 38 pupils were bussed from the Hawthorne Avenue School in Newark, New Jersey, to Verona's four elementary schools. The transfer program, called Project for Sharing Educational Opportunities, has not been in operation long enough for any effective evaluation, although one will be carried out by Educational Testing Service personnel from Princeton, New Jersey. Anecdotal records indicate much support for the project and a general feeling among supporters that it has been a success, but several obstacles jeopardize the future of the program. When opponents collected 2,300 signatures demanding a referendum and were turned down, they charged "high-handed tactics." An opponent was elected to the school board in February, 1969, turning the balance from 4-1 in favor to a narrow 3-2 margin. Law suits have been instituted by a Citizens for a Fair Decision organization and, while some feel that the original animosities have eased, others are not so sure.

A start was also made toward voluntary pupil interchange programs in the Washington, D.C. area, where 21 children from Meyer Elementary School

in the District of Columbia were bussed to Bannockburn Elementary School in Bethesda, Maryland, beginning in the 1968-69 school year. Activities of the extra-curricular nature were to be emphasized as well as classroom programs. Random participation among volunteer pupils was adopted, with local adults signed up in Maryland to provide responsibility for youngsters in the event of an emergency. The tuition fee and all other expenses of the program are paid;by the District of Columbia Board of Education. The budget of $40,000 includes funds for a design for evaluation as well as planning money to develop "a true exchange program" for the years ahead. However, changes in the structure of the District of Columbia government and a new superintendent of schools places this project in the questionable bracket for the years ahead.

Other proposals for urban-suburban bussing are brought up from time to time, but there have been fewer in 1969 than for several previous years. A small group of activist Hewlett High School students in a predominantly Jewish, virtually all-white area in southwestern Nassau County, New York, recently proposed that a limited number of poor black children be bussed into the local schools from New York City ghettos. Many parents backed the idea, but many normally-liberal citizens opposed the plan, with reasons such as "We've made it and we don't want to lose what we've sacrificed to get." While there are many similarities between Hewlett and Great Neck, including those of ethnic, economic and ideological characteristics, one significant difference concerns space in elementary schools--while Great Neck had some extra classroom space, Hewlett has little room to spare. From a practical point of view, the author would not be surprised if nothing further is heard from this particular proposal for some time to come.

The city-to-suburb school bussing plan in Newburgh, New York, does not really come under the scope of this study, since the suburb involved was recently incorporated into the Newburgh School District. The plan to bus 1,230 students out of Newburgh schools in the inner-city was opposed by the NAACP because it would not achieve reasonable racial balance and by the parents association of the Fostertown School since 90 of their own children would be bussed to the city to make room for the Newburgh pupils. However, no complications exist insofar as school district boundaries are concerned--but the possibility of incorporation of school districts into metropolitan school boundaries is one mentioned as a possible solution of urban-suburban problems by many educators today.

Those residents of affluent Scarsdale, New York are awaiting the results of months of study of a proposal to bus 60 Negro kindergarten and first-grade pupils to Scarsdale from Mount Vernon with 30 children to be added each year until 390 Negro pupils would be attending school in Scarsdale from kindergarten through grade 12. The proposal, prepared by the Scarsdale Council of Parent-Teachers Associations, met with mixed reaction and any decisions were put off until after assessment of a six-week summer program in math, language arts and science for 50 eighth-grade underachievers from Scarsdale and 50 from Mount Vernon. An interesting reaction was the statement by Dr. deMarinis, president of the Mount Vernon School Board, who called the proposal the white man's burden and said, "It's a question of just soothing their consciences--like brinding in a couple of people for show and tell."

The author will continue to follow developments in this and other areas of potential urban-suburban cooperative programs, but doubts that

many radical new ventures will be initiated in this period of taxpayer rebellion, racial backlash, dwindling federal grants, and the lack of school facilities in many metropolitan school districts of the nation.

6. CONCLUSIONS

As has been pointed out in foregoing sections of this final report, ongoing programs subjected to evaluation have been few indeed, and none has been in existence for more than three years at the time of this writing. However, there have been consistent reports on many factors of the programs which, together with subjective analysis on the part of the author, leads me to the following conclusions:

1. In general, the academic achievement of participants in the urban-suburban programs has been significantly high, particularly in the case of inner city children exposed to the suburban environment, who performed much better than control groups back in the inner-city schools. Suburban children seemed to react positively in achievement when placed in integrated classes. Further study is necessary to relate the degree of improvement of experimental, urban groups vis-a-vis suburban counterparts. The danger that the inner city children might not measure up to this challenge was classed as a real one by at least one evaluator.

2. The worst fears of the parents and educators that riots, street fighting, and misbehavior would ensue as a consequence of urban-suburban cooperative programs were never realized. To the contrary--most evidence indicates that the behavior problem incidence was lower than one would expect under these conditions and may even have been lower than in homogeneous situations faced in normal urban or suburban settings. Once the first day--or week--or month was passed in all appropriate programs, queasy parents, teachers, project directors and pupils breathed huge sighs of relief and the projects went on in a more relaxed fashion.

3. Many projects studied by the author made little or no efforts to evaluate changes in critical thinking, attitudes, or other non-academic phases of the school program. However, in those which did make such an attempt, though instruments were vastly divergent, the evidence attained indicates that there were wide changes in attitudes in the direction of greater tolerance for those from different backgrounds. This was particularly true of suburban pupils, who, in the Woodbridge cooperative program, changed their attitudes toward the goals of the summer school program to a significant degree each year the program was held.

4. Parents and other citizens in the inner-city areas generally supported the goals of the programs from the beginning, though some accused them of "mere tokenism". However, in each of the urban-suburban programs analyzed there was preliminary opposition which all but split the community in half and which made approval by the Board of Educations involved more of a "Profile of Courage" than a sound, sober analysis of the factors to be assessed. Most such opposition in communities adopting a program mitigated after a year, and almost disappeared as a "hawkish" barrier to an effective project. My own interviews and surveys in Woodbridge indicate that those violently opposed became more neutral after a year or two of observing the program in action, while those neutral or mildly opposed at the start

became mild if critical supporters of the program once its operation showed promise of success.

5. However, in areas where the program was not approved, the bitterness engendered by the battle between the proponents and opponents of various plans has done much to polarize the community. While programs of this nature seemed on the rise during early 1968, the past few months has shown a reverse motion based on a translation of civil rights "backlash" and taxpayers' "rebellions" into violent and uncompromising opposition to urban-suburban programs regardless of material presented by those supporting the experiments. Inflation has driven school budgets up and up in even affluent areas, while state aid has faltered and the experiments once supported by federal funds have become the first victims of cutbacks in Title I and Title III funds from Washington as well as in Office of Economic Opportunity programs and budgets.

6. A growing number of citizens have become aware that rejecting the alternative of urban-suburban voluntary exchange of pupils limits solutions to problems of educational opportunity in America today. The search for an answer to the question, "How is it possible to provide equal educational opportunity for youngsters who live in the deteriorating inner city area?" Should voluntary, cooperative programs not answer this question, it is inevitable that more radical answers will be developed which differ in their determination to eliminate traditional district boundaries and create metropolitan systems of education.

A report adopted by the National Education Association's executive committee at its 1968 Houston meeting urged local government and school authorities to "redraw district and school attendance boundaries to include both minority and majority groups in a district or attendance area, by, for example, combining urban and suburban school systems."

In the same year, a government task force recommended that school taxation in metropolitan areas be assessed regionally, by state mandate if necessary, so that some of the money in affluent suburbs can flow to inner-city schools. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, headed by former Florida Governor Farris Bryant, proposed that "educational financial districts be established to equalize educational opportunity by channeling a share of the fiscal resources of affluent suburbs to the underfinanced urban schools that are overburdened with high-cost disadvantaged students."

If the promise and hope of voluntary, cooperative interchange programs across district lines is not realized, such alternatives will doubtless take their place within a decade's time.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The first and most apparent recommendation involves the need for further study of existing programs and the opportunity to evaluate new programs in areas where urban-suburban projects could serve as an alternative to current problems in both the inner-city and suburban school districts. Once data from more advanced and more varied projects is available, more firm conclusions and recommendations can be advanced in future studies of this nature.

However, the rejection of proposals almost out-of-hand by communities like Great Neck, New York and Plainedge, New York is a symptom of "community resistance" as was stated in the previous section of this report. A model must be devised to present to all sectors of a community the advantages, costs, and procedures of a projected cooperative program as well as a complete, comprehensive evaluation of similar experiments in the past. The memorandum to Great Neck citizens from the Center for Urban Education (which has established a free "hotline" service for administrators seeking information on educating disadvantaged children, including data on city-to-suburb busing programs) was a start, but was handicapped by its introduction on the scene after most opposition had already jelled.

The most successful program to date in terms of expansion and community support was doubtless the beginning of the Hartford Project Concern project which enjoyed the support of the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce and which was initiated at a town meeting with the participation of the business, industrial, political and civic leaders of the community. Similarly, the formation of METCO in the Boston area included in its membership parents of inner-city and suburban children; public and private school administrators; city and town school committees; civil and human rights groups; education-action councils; institutions of higher education; and the Massachusetts Department of Education.

This establishment of positive community support to give its backing to necessary experimental projects of this nature is the first step--followed by an evaluative model of other programs and a comprehensive survey of probable impact on the inner-city and the suburbs to be involved. Where emotions have sped ahead of factual analysis, programs have been defeated and entire communities have been adversely affected.

Another recommendation was pressed on the author by many teachers and parents whom he interviewed. It deals with the inability of many teachers, some of whom are from the finest colleges, to cope with the problems of urban-suburban teaching. Apparently there is a great need for courses in urban sociology, race and culture, and the methods of teaching the disadvantaged despite all the institutes and federal funding in this area in recent years. Curricular change and school district revisions for meeting these challenges are also elements which require exposure for teachers, administrators and future citizens in all walks of life.

Those who are familiar with the Coleman report on "Equality of Educational Opportunity" know that one of its main theses dealt with the reason nonwhites learn less than whites. It is not so much the lack of good teachers, or funding, or facilities, that handicap the black student, but, according to Coleman and his colleagues, the reason lies outside the classroom and involves changes in a pupil's social and cultural life. This point gives strong support to the need for voluntary urban-suburban programs to help eliminate educational problems more effectively than through attempts to inject massive amounts of funding to hire new teachers, buy new books, and build more impressive facilities. Surely there is no better way in American education to positively affect the social and cultural life of disadvantaged pupils than to experiment along the lines of the programs analyzed in this report.

The last recommendation deals with fiscal and programmatic support. Other than the Center for Urban Education and some smaller organizations, there is no central source to encourage and support experimental projects of this nature. Fiscal support from Title I of the ESEA is now spread across states with little regard for the needs of the disadvantaged. Title III funds are withdrawn after three years of support--really before a community can assess the evaluations of important programs like these and thus decide whether to take over the required support. Budgets of the Office of Economic Opportunity have been cut sharply. All of these cutbacks have come at a time when state aid has dwindled in many areas of the nation, and when school district budgets have hit record highs. There is neither fiscal incentive nor program guidance for communities which wish to band together to solve their own urban-suburban difficulties through voluntary, cooperative programs which cross district lines.

I therefore recommend that a national committee on goals for urban-suburban education be established, perhaps under the aegis of the U. S. Office of Education, to disseminate research and analyses of these programs and to place funding of experimental projects throughout the nation on a sound basis by attracting foundation and citizen support. By selecting the best of various experimental programs, this committee could eventually formulate more effective solutions to problems facing the metropolitan areas of the United States with minimal cost, divisiveness and confusion to all concerned. A potential explosive area between those of differing racial, economic and social characteristics could thus be avoided through the encouraging of appropriate urban-suburban educational programs on a longterm, logical basis.

8. REFERENCES

A. References to the Woodbridge Summer Project:

1. Woodbridge Cooperative Urban-Suburban Summer School, 1967 and 1968 reports of Title III projects.

   Available from Alexander Raffone, Superintendent of Schools Beecher Road School, Woodbridge, Connecticut 06525.

B. References to the West Hartford Summer Project:

1. Urban/Suburban School Mixing; a Feasibility Study; West Hartford Summer School, 1966. Report of project sponsored by a grant from the Community Action Programs, Office of Economic Opportunity, Project Director: S. Francis Overlan.

C. References to Project Concern:

1. Project Concern--1966-1968; a report on the effectiveness of suburban school placement for inner-city youth. Final technical report. Thomas W. Mahan, Ph.D. Hartford, Conn., August, 1968. Available from Hartford Public Schools, 249 High Street, Hartford, Connecticut 06103.

2. Mahan, Thomas. Position Paper: Conference on Education and Racial Imbalance in the City, March, 1967.

3. Fact Sheet for the New Haven Area Project Concern. June 20, 1969. Available from Director Joseph Samuels, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent, New Haven Public Schools, 200 Orange Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06510.

D. References to METCO project:

1. Memo from METCO, November, 1966.

2. Hammel, Lisa, "Buses that bring together two Separate and Unequal Worlds", New York Times, April 4, 1969, p. 22.

3. Killory, Joseph (director), INTERIM REPORTS, on file at Center for Urban Education Library, New York, New York.

E. References to West Irondequoit project:

1. Hapeman, Clement Finch, Teacher and Administrator Evaluations of the West Irondequoit Intercultural Enrichment Program, Spring, 1967.

2. Hitti, Fred; Green, Russel; and Sanderson, Harold, A Longitudinal Study of the West Irondequoit Program of Integrated Education, 1967.

3. Rock, Dr. William and associates, A Report on A Cooperative

Program between a City School District and a Suburban School District, June 28, 1968.

4. Committee for Intercultural Education, The; Focus on Understanding.

All the above publications can be obtained from the Board of Education, West Irondequoit, New York.

F. References to Great Neck and Wyandanch, New York.

I have compiled a group of clippings on both controversies which include over 725 newspaper articles during the period 1967-1969 from the New York Times, Newsday, the Long Island Press, the New York News, and the Suffolk Sun.

G. References to Washington, D.C.-Montgomery County, Maryland, program.

1. "Bannockburn-Meyer Education Proposal", minutes of Board meeting of June 26, 1968, available from the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Thirteenth and K. St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

H. References to Verona, New Jersey, program.

1. Waggoner, Walter H., "Verona Proposes Busing of Pupils", New York Times, May 5, 1968.

2. Waggoner, Walter H., "Verona Busing Going Smoothly, but School Election Threatens It," New York Times, February 23, 1969.

I. References to Scarsdale, New York, program.

1. Blumenthal, Ralph, "Busing Plan finis Mt. Vernon Foes", New York Times, March 24, 1968, p. 70.

I. General References to Urban-Suburban Interchange Programs.

1. Saturday Review, February 18, 1967, p. 79.

2. Buskin, Martin. School Management, October, 1967, pp. 67-76.

3. Center for Urban Education, Memorandum to Board of Education of Great Neck from Center for Urban Education, subject: aspects of a suburban-urban program of student transfer. New York, Center for Urban Education, 1967. (On file at C.U.E. library)

4. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Report of the Commission, 1967.

5. Coleman, James, and associates, Equality of Educational Opportunity. 1966, 732 pp.

6. Jencks, Christopher, "A Reappraisal of the Most Controversial Educational Document of Our Time", New York Times Magazine, August 10, 1969, p. 12.

7. Miel, Alice with Kiester, Jr., Edwin, The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia, Institute of Human Relations, New York, 1967.

9. APPENDIX

A. WOODBRIDGE EVALUATIVE SCHEDULE
SUMMER, 1969

Thursday, May 29:	Luncheon discussion of plans for testing and evaluation.
Early June:	Administration of Gates-MacGinitie Readiness Tests (K) Administration of Stanford Achievement Tests (one form) Primary I--Grade 1 Primary II--Grades 2 and 3 Intermediate I--Grade 4 Administration of Pupil Attitudinal Pretests
Mid-June	Lists of pupils available from New Haven and Woodbridge. Mailing of parent attitudinal pretest to parents sending from New Haven and Woodbridge as well as to sample of Woodbridge parents not sending.
June 30, July 1:	Presession interviews with teachers and staff. In-depth interviews with 4 parents sending and 4 not sending.
July 1-August 12:	Summer School Program (except July 4)
Week of August 4:	Administration of Gates-MacGinitie Readiness Tests (K) Administration of other form of appropriate Stanford Tests.
August 8:	Administration of pupil attitudinal posttest. Mailing of parent attitudinal posttest to New Haven and Woodbridge parents sending as well as to sample of Woodbridge parents not sending.
August 13-15:	Interviews with teachers and staff during debriefing. Written openended questionnaire handed to teachers and staff for return at their leisure. Parent interviews--2 Woodbridge parents sending and 2 not sending and 4 New Haven parents sending.

B. Example of questionnaire sent to Woodbridge parents (blanks for strongly agree, tend to agree, uncertain, tend to disagree and strongly disagree provided on actual form)

1. More behavior problems result from a cooperative urban-suburban summer school.
2. Children in the suburbs need contact with inner-city children for a fuller understanding of people.
3. School districts should be realigned to conform with metropolitan areas rather than community boundaries.
4. The Woodbridge urban-suburban summer school program had beneficial effects on both the New Haven and Woodbridge communities.
5. Urban-suburban summer school programs are the beginning of the end of the American freedom of choice.
6. Inner-city pupils benefit from the opportunities of a suburban school setting.
7. There are some ill effects on the Woodbridge and New Haven communities because of the combined summer school.
8. The best school districts are those which relate taxes to services by retaining community boundaries.
9. The Woodbridge summer school program had its greatest effect on the academic level of the pupils.
10. Suburban children do not necessarily need contact with inner-city pupils in their formative years.
11. There was no opportunity for democratic choice in the establishment of the urban-suburban summer school program.
12. Children in the urban-suburban summer school program gained far more than mere exposure to academic subject matter.
13. It is better if inner-city children are not shown the way of life of suburbia.
14. It is doubtful if any behavior problems resulted from inviting urban and suburban children to share the Woodbridge summer school program.
15. There isn't any advantage for children attending summer school unless they are having troubles with one or more subjects in regular class.

C. Example of questionnaire for pupils, grades 4, 5 and 6
(YES and NO answer sheet provided with appropriate instructions)

1. Do you like the new children you've met here this summer?
2. Did your Mommy and Daddy want you to come to this school?
3. Do you like to go to school right near your own home?
4. Would you like to play with the new children you've met here after summer school is over?
5. Do you like going to this summer school?
6. Would you rather go to school in New Haven than in Woodbridge?
7. Would you rather be home playing than in school this summer?
8. Would you like to go to school on the bus instead of going right near your home?
9. Would you rather go to school in Woodbridge than in New Haven?
10. Do you like this summer school better than your regular school?
11. Do you think this summer school is just horrible and bad?
12. When you go home tonight, would you rather play with your old friends than with these new children you have met here?
13. Do you dislike some of the children you have met here in this summer school?
14. Would you like to come to another summer school like this next year?
15. Do you think some of the new children you've just met are nicer than your old friends and playmates?
16. Was it your own idea to come to this summer school?
17. Do you think children from Woodbridge, New Haven and other places should go to school together?
18. Would you rather learn lots of new things instead of meeting new children this summer?
19. Would you like to go to school with all these boys and girls all year instead of just in the summer?
20. Would you like to do other things besides just study with these new children this summer?